**Descriptions of reciprocity or mutuality in literature**

**Service-Learning/Community Engagement Literature**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source (in brief) | Description |
| Lowery et al (2006) A Logic Model of Service-Learning: Tensions and Issues for further consideration—section on reciprocity  Refers to Jacoby (1996), Kendall (1990) and Berry (1990) re reciprocity -- FIND | “As described by Chrislip and Larson (1994), reciprocity is a “kaleidoscope lens” of sorts, in which meanings vary from partner to partner. According to Jacoby (1996) and Sigmon (1994), reciprocity requires all participants in service-learning to proceed as learners, providers of service, and recipients of service; we should all both teach and learn.” (p. 53) |
| Jacoby, 1996 |  |
| Kendall, 1990 |  |
| Berry, 1990 |  |
| Carnegie Classifications re mutuality? |  |
| Rhoads, 1997 - mutuality | “Through the other we come to experience the self. Mutuality is about how we both give and receive because we connect to the other through a concern, which in the name of caring bridges whatever differences we have” (p. 139) |
| Hill Warter & Grossman (2001) in  “SL: The Essence of the Pedagogy”  Chapter 4 | “The notion of bidirectionality posits that if one individual influences another, the individual that produced the change is in turn influenced through a reciprocal interaction (Lerner, 1986). Thus, individuals shape, and are shaped, by the interactions they have with their environment and the relationships they have with others.” P. 88  “In the SL literature, the notion of reciprocity holds a very similar meaning to the developmental concept of bidirectionality. A reciprocal relationship involves service participants and recipients mutually providing and receiving a service or educational experience.” P. 88  Per Greene the “student and the individual served are not passive recipients of education and some charitable act, respectfully, but they are co-participants in an enhanced, multifaceted experience” (1998, p 411) p 88/89  “Both service recipient and participant give and receive in a mutually beneficial experience and assume the roles of educator and educated” (Greene, 1998” p. 89  “transformation and empowerment” experienced by both student and community member (Greene, 1998)   * in SL lit. reciprocity focuses on “individual interaction” bidirectionality in developmental-contextualism extends this to include reciprocal relationships with “broader systems” p. 89 – examined through reflection |
| Sandmann, Kliewer, Kim, Omerikwa (2010) “Toward understanding reciprocity in community-university (CU) partnerships”  Chp 1 “in Research for What?: Making engaged scholarship matter”  (includes Brandon from our group!)  **Worth reading as whole chapter addresses reciprocity and mutuality in relation to power** | *Very selective quotes:*  “Reciprocity and mutuality are fundamental values and inherent goals of community-engaged partnerships. “ p. 4  “As Driscoll (2008) reports, “most institutions could only describe in vague generalities how they had achieved genuine reciprocity with their communities” (p. 41). Further analysis by Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, and Buglione (2009) found that campuses that adopted Boyer’s scholarship categories tended to frame community engagement as “application to” a community, instead of engagement “with” communities, an indicator of reciprocity.” P. 4  The authors note that they “too found [themselves] seeking a deeper, richer understanding of attempts at achieving reciprocity and mutuality in partnerships [they] were studying.” P. 5  Study considers how power influences reciprocity and mutuality in CU relationships  “reciprocity, mutuality, and power are each complex concepts” p. 5  “Reciprocity can be defined as the negotiated process of working with a partner as opposed to doing something to or for a partner. Mutuality is a shared process that is collectively beneficial.” P. 5  --relationships between these concepts changes  “Reciprocal relationships are bounded within socially constructed relationships and institutions. Therefore, to understand the nature of reciprocity, the elements of power (knowledge, positions, processes, and systems) that operate in and result from social relationships and institutions must be acknowledged” p. 5  --“Foucault’s (1997) assertion that people should stop describing the effects of power in negative expressions like *exclude, repress,* and *censor* [italics in original] is arguably a way of championing reciprocity.” P. 20  “the power analysis of each relationship and the concomitant varying definitions of mutuality and reciprocity can provide a basis for enhanced efforts toward more democratic and reciprocal community-engaged practices for both the community and the campus partners.” P. 20  “Further research is needed in defining the philosophical requirements of just community-university partnerships” p. 21 (This quote is followed by some possible research questions relating to reciprocity) |
| Saltmarsh et al (2009) Community Engagement and institutional culture in HE – Chapter 1, pp 3 - 29  *Creating our identities in SL and CE* | --relates reciprocity to Boyer’s (1996) concept of scholarship of engagement – note that “special climate” referred to by Boyer is “explicitly and intentionally reciprocal” p. 11.  --“The scholarship of engagement O’Meara and Rice (2005) note, is based on reciprocity and “calls on faculty to move beyond outreach,”…What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration:* [italics in chapter] that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared.” P. 11  --note that Carnegie CE framework sees CE as “grounded in faculty teaching, research, and service that are defined by reciprocity” p. 11  --“the discourse around community engagement that is done “to” or “in” the community is contrasted with applications that expressed collaborative, multidirectional relationships that indicate reciprocity” p. 20 –give example of a campus that descriptive CES as “partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors”—another reciprocity is “an *ongoing two-way interchange of knowledge, information, understanding, and services* [emphasis in application] between the university and the state, nation, and world. P. 20  --note that most institutions vague re how achieved reciprocity with partners  “..at its core, authentic engagement depends on—and is in fact defined by—reciprocity; without reciprocity in community relationships, there cannot be engagement.” P. 21  “Reciprocity as a core value provides the grounding for changes in institutional practices, which in turn can compel significant changes in institutional culture.” p. 21  “Reciprocity signals an epistemological shift that values not only expert knowledge that is rational, analytic, and positivist but also a different kind of rationality that is more relational, localized, and contextual and favors mutual deference between laypersons and academics. With reciprocity, knowledge generation is a process of cocreation, which involves “the design of problem-solving actions through collaborative knowledge construction with the legitimate stakeholders in the problem” (Greenwood, 2008, p. 327)” p. 22 |
|  |  |